





# THE END

THE END OF THE WORLD  
IS AT HAND  
AND WE ARE  
TO BE  
REDEEMED  
BY THE  
BLOOD OF  
JESUS  
CHRIST  
THE SON OF  
DAVID  
THE KING  
OF JUDAH  
THE KING  
OF ISRAEL  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HEAVENS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
EARTH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
UNIVERSE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GLORY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
LIFE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
TRUTH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
JUSTICE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
PEACE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HAPPINESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
WISDOM  
THE KING  
OF THE  
POWER  
THE KING  
OF THE  
WEALTH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HONOR  
THE KING  
OF THE  
RESPECT  
THE KING  
OF THE  
ADMIRATION  
THE KING  
OF THE  
LOVE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GENTLENESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
PATIENCE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
KINDNESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GOODNESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
BEAUTY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GRACE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
MERCY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
FAITH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HOPE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
CHARITY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
TRUTH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
JUSTICE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
PEACE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HAPPINESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
WISDOM  
THE KING  
OF THE  
POWER  
THE KING  
OF THE  
WEALTH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HONOR  
THE KING  
OF THE  
RESPECT  
THE KING  
OF THE  
LOVE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GENTLENESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
PATIENCE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
KINDNESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GOODNESS  
THE KING  
OF THE  
BEAUTY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
GRACE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
MERCY  
THE KING  
OF THE  
FAITH  
THE KING  
OF THE  
HOPE  
THE KING  
OF THE  
CHARITY

# A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD

RICHARD,

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON OCCASION OF No. 90,

IN THE SERIES CALLED

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BY J. H. NEWMAN, B.D.

VICAR OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN'S, OXFORD.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCCXLI.

# THE HISTORY OF THE

## ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

FROM ITS ORIGIN TO THE PRESENT TIME

By JOHN HENRY LALOR, Esq. F.R.S.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

LONDON: PRINTED BY J. SHRIMPTON, 15, N. MARK LANE. 1845.

VOL. I.

THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY.

FROM 1660 TO 1680.

# A L E T T E R,

&c.

---

MY DEAR LORD,

It may seem strange that, on receipt of a message from your Lordship, I should proceed at once, instead of silently obeying it, to put on paper some remarks of my own on the subject of it; yet, as you kindly permit me to take such a course, with the expectation that I may thereby succeed in explaining to yourself and others my own feelings and intentions in the occurrence which has given rise to your Lordship's interference, I trust to your Lordship's indulgence to pardon me any discursiveness in my style of writing, or appearance of familiarity, or prominent introduction of myself, which may be incidental to the attempt.

Your Lordship's message is as follows: That your Lordship considers that the Tract No. 90. in the Series called the Tracts for the Times, is "objectionable, and may tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church," and that it is your Lordship's "advice that the Tracts for the Times should be discontinued."

Your Lordship has, I trust, long known quite enough of my feelings towards any such expression of your Lordship's wishes, to be sure I should at



once obey it, though it were ever so painful to me, or contrary to the course I should have taken if left to myself. And I do most readily and cheerfully obey you in this instance; and at the same time express my great sorrow that any writing of mine should be judged objectionable by your Lordship, and of a disturbing tendency, and my hope that in what I write in future I shall be more successful in approving myself to your Lordship.

I have reminded your Lordship of my willingness on a former occasion to submit myself to any wishes of your Lordship, had you thought it advisable at that time to signify them. In your Lordship's Charge in 1838, an allusion was made to the Tracts for the Times. Some opponents of the Tracts said that your Lordship treated them with undue indulgence. I will not imply that your Lordship can act otherwise than indulgently to any one, but certainly I did feel at the time, that in the midst of the kindness you shewed to me personally, you were exercising an anxious vigilance over my publication, which reminded me of my responsibility to your Lordship. I wrote to the Archdeacon on the subject, submitting the Tracts entirely to your Lordship's disposal. What I thought about your Charge will appear from the words I then used to him. I said, "A Bishop's lightest word *ex Cathedrâ*, is heavy. His judgment on a book cannot be light. It is a rare occurrence." And I offered to withdraw any of the Tracts over which I had control, if I were informed which were those to which your Lordship had objections. I afterwards wrote to your Lordship to this effect: that

“ I trusted I might say sincerely, that I should feel a more lively pleasure in knowing that I was submitting myself to your Lordship’s expressed judgment in a matter of that kind, than I could have even in the widest circulation of the volumes in question.” Your Lordship did not think it necessary to proceed to such a measure, but I felt, and always have felt, that, if ever you determined on it, I was bound to obey.

Accordingly on the late occasion, directly I heard that you had expressed an unfavourable opinion of Tract 90, I again placed myself at your disposal, and now readily submit to the course on which your Lordship has finally decided in consequence of it. I am quite sure that in so doing I am not only fulfilling a duty I owe to your Lordship, but consulting for the well-being of the Church, and benefiting myself.

And now, in proceeding to make some explanations in addition, which your Lordship desires of me, I hope I shall not say a word which will seem like introducing discussion before your Lordship. It would ill become me to be stating private views of my own, and defending them, on an occasion like this. If I allude to what has been maintained in the Tracts, it will not be at all by way of maintaining it in these pages, but in illustration of the impressions and the drift with which they have been written. I need scarcely say they are thought by many to betray a leaning towards Roman Catholic error, and a deficient appreciation of our own truth; and your Lordship wishes me to shew that

these apprehensions have no foundation in fact. This I propose to do, and that by extracts from what I have before now written on the subject, which, while they can be open to no suspicion of having been provided to serve an occasion, will, by being now cited, be made a second time my own.

2. First, however, I hope to be allowed to make one or two remarks by way of explaining some peculiarities in the Tracts which at first sight might appear, if not to tend toward Romanism, at least to alienate their readers from that favoured communion in which God's good providence has placed us.

I know it is a prevalent idea, and entertained by persons of such consideration that it cannot be lightly treated, that many of the Tracts are the writing of persons who either are ignorant of what goes on in the world, and are gratifying their love of antiquarian research or of intellectual exercise at any risk; or, who are culpably reckless of consequences, or even find a satisfaction in the sensation or disturbance which may result from such novelties or paradoxes as they may find themselves in a condition to put forward. It is thought, that the writers in question often have had no aim at all in what they have hazarded, that they did not mean what they said, that they did not know the strength of their own words, and that they were putting forth the first crude notions which came into their minds; or that they were pursuing principles to their consequences as a sort of pastime, and developing their own theories in grave practical mat-



ters, in which no one should move without a deep sense of responsibility. In fact, that whatever incidental or intrinsic excellence there may be in the Tracts, and whatever direct or indirect benefits have attended them, there is much in them which is nothing more or less than mischievous, and convicts its authors of a wanton inconsiderateness towards the feelings of others.

I am very far from saying that there is any one evil temper or motive which may not have its share in any thing that I write myself; and it does not become me to deny the charge as far as it is brought against me, though I am not conscious of its justice. But still I would direct attention to this circumstance, that what persons who are not in the position of the writers of the Tracts set down to wantonness, may have its definite objects, though those objects be not manifest to those who are in other positions. I am neither maintaining that those objects are real, or important, or defensible, or pursued wisely or seasonably; but if they exist in the mind of the writers, I trust they will serve so far as to relieve them from the odious charge of scattering firebrands about without caring for or apprehending consequences.

May I then, without (as I have said) at all assuming the soundness of the doctrines to be mentioned, or by mentioning them seeking indirectly a sanction for them from your Lordship, be allowed to allude to one or two Tracts, merely in illustration of what I have said?

One of the latest Tracts is written upon "The

Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church." It discusses the subject of the mystical interpretation of nature and Scripture with a learning and seriousness which no one will wish to deny; but the question arises, and has actually been asked, why discuss it at all? why startle and unsettle the Christian of this age by modes of thought which are now unusual and strange; and which being thus fixed upon the Fathers, serve but to burden with an additional unpopularity an authority which the Church of England has ever revered, ever used in due measure to support her own claims upon the attachment of her children? But the state of the case has been this. For some years the argument in favour of our Church drawn from Antiquity has been met by the assertion, that that same Antiquity held also other opinions which no one now would think of maintaining; that if it were mistaken in one set of opinions, it might be in the other; that its mistakes were of a nature which argued feebleness of intellect, or unsoundness of judgment, or want of logical acumen in those who held them, which would avail against its authority in the instance in which it was used, as well as in that in which it was passed over. Moreover it was said that those who used it in defence of the Church knew this well, but were not honest enough to confess it. They were challenged to confess or deny the charges thus brought against the Fathers; and, since to deny the fact was supposed impossible, they were bid to draw out a case, such, as either to admit of a defence of the fact on grounds of reason,

or of its surrender without surrendering the authority of the Fathers altogether.

Such challenges, and they have not been unfrequent, afford, I conceive, a sufficient reason for any one who considers that the Church of England derives essential assistance from Christian antiquity in her interpretation of Scripture, to enter upon the examination of the particular objections by which certain authors have assailed its authority. Yet it is plain that by those who had not heard of their writings, such an examination would be considered a wanton mootng of points which no one had called in question.

Again, much animadversion has been expressed, and in quarters which claim the highest deference, upon the Tract upon "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge." Yet I do not think it will be called a wanton exercise of ingenuity. Not only does it bear marks, which no reader can mistake, of deep earnestness, but it in fact originated in a conviction in the mind of the writer of certain actual evils at present resulting from the defective appreciation with which the mass of even religious men regard the mysteries and privilèges of the Gospel.

And another Tract, which has experienced a great deal of censure, is that which is made up of Selections from the Roman Breviary. I will not here take upon me to say a word in its defence, except to rescue its author from the charge of wantonness. He had observed what a very powerful source of attraction the Church of Rome possessed in her devotional Services, and he wished, judiciously or



not, to remove it by claiming it for ourselves. He was desirous of shewing, that such Devotions would be but a continuation in private of those public Services which we use in Church; and that they might be used by individuals with a sort of fitness, (removing such portions as were against the Anglican creed or practice,) *because* they were a continuation. He said, in the opening of the Tract,

“It will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries’ hands; who have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs.... It may suggest.... character and matter for our private devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public Services; a use of it which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun.” *Tract 75.*

I repeat it, that I have no intention here of defending the proceeding except from the charge of wantonness; and with that view I would add, that though there is a difference not to be mistaken between a book published by authority and an anonymous Tract, yet, as far as its object is concerned, it is not very unlike the publication of Bishop Cosin’s Hours of Prayer, of which I hope I may be permitted to remind your Lordship in the words of the recent Editor.

“At the first coming of the Queen Henrietta into England, she and her French ladies, it appears, were equally surprised and dissatisfied at the disregard of the hours of Prayer, and the want of Breviaries. Their remarks, and perhaps the strength of their arguments, and the beauty of many of their books, induced the Protestant ladies of the house-

hold, to apply to King Charles. The King consulted Bishop White as to the best plan of supplying them with Forms of Prayer, collected out of already approved Forms. The Bishop assured him of the ease and the great necessity of such a work, and chose Cosin as the fittest person to frame the Manual. He at once undertook it, and in three months finished it and brought it to the King. The Bishop of London (Mountain), who was commanded to read it over and make his report, is said to have liked it so well, that instead of employing a Chaplain as was usual, he gave it an "*imprimatur*" under his own hand. There were at first only two hundred copies printed. There was, as Evelyn tells us, nothing of Cosin's own composure, nor any name set as author to it, but those necessary prefaces, &c., touching the times and seasons of Prayer, all the rest being entirely translated and collected out of an Office published by authority of Queen Elizabeth and out of our own Liturgy. 'This,' adds Evelyn, 'I rather mention to justify that industrious and pious Dean, who had exceedingly suffered by it, as if he had done it of his own head to introduce Popery, from which no man was more averse, and who was one who, in this time of temptation and apostasy, held and confirmed many to our Church.'

"The book soon grew into esteem, and justified the judgment which had been passed upon it, so that many who were at first startled at the title, 'found in the body of it so much piety, such regular forms of divine worship, such necessary consolations in special exigencies, that they reserved it by them as a jewel of great price and value.' 'Not one book,' it was said, 'was in more esteem with the Church of England, next to the Office of the Liturgy itself.' It appears, in fact, to have become exceedingly popular, and ran through ten editions, the last of which was published in 1719." *Preface to Cosin's Devotions*, p. xi.—xiii.

3. There has been another, and more serious pecu-

liarity in the line of discussion adopted in the Tracts, which, whatever its merits or demerits, has led to their being charged, I earnestly hope groundlessly, with wanton innovation on things established. I mean the circumstance that they have attempted to defend our Ecclesiastical system upon almost first principles. The *immediate* argument for acquiescing in what is established is that it *is* established: but when what has been established is in course of alteration, (and this evil was partly realized, and feared still more, eight years since,) the argument ceases, and then one is driven to considerations which are less safe because less investigated, which it is impossible at once to survey in all their bearings, or to have confidence in, that they will not do a disservice to the cause we are defending as well as a benefit. It seemed safe at the period in question, when the immediate and usual arguments failed, to recur to those which were used by our divines in the seventeenth century, and by the most esteemed in the century which followed, and down to this day. But every existing establishment, whatever be its nature, is a *fact*, a thing *sui simile*, which cannot be resolved into any one principle, nor can be defended and built up upon one idea. Its position is the result of a long history, which has moulded it, and stationed it, in the form and place which characterize it. It has grown into what it is by the influence of a number of concurrent causes in time past, and in consequence no one first principle can be urged in its defence, but what in some other respect or measure may also possibly be urged against it. This applies, I conceive, as to



all social institutions, so to the case of our religious establishment and system at this day. It is a matter of extreme difficulty and delicacy, to say the least, so to defend them in an argumentative discussion in one respect as not to tend to unsettle them in another. And all but minds of the greatest powers, or even genius, will find nothing left to them, if they do attempt it, but to strike a balance between gain and loss, and to attempt to do the most good on the whole.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood as if, in thus speaking, I meant to justify to your Lordship the consequences which have followed under these circumstances from the attempts of the Tracts for the Times in defence of the Church. I am but shewing that, even though evil has resulted, it need not have been wanton evil. Nor am I at all insinuating, that our established system is necessarily in fault, because it was exposed to this inconvenience; rather, as I have said, the cause lies in the nature of things, abstract principles being no sufficient measure of matters of fact. There cannot be a clearer proof of this than will be found in a reference to that antagonist system, which it has been the object of the Tracts in so great a measure to oppose. I do not put the case of Rome and her defenders as parallel to that between the Tracts and our own Church, of course; it would be preposterous to do so; but it may avail as an *à fortiori* argument, considering how systematic and complete the Roman system is, and what transcendent ability is universally allowed to Bossuet. Yet even Bossuet,

so great a controversialist, could not defend Romanism, so perfect a system, without doing a harm while he did a service. At least we may fairly conclude, that what the authorities of the Church of Rome thought to be a disservice to it, really was so at the time, though in the event it might prove a benefit. Dr. Maclaine in a note on his translation of Mosheim, observes of Bossuet's Exposition: "It is remarkable that nine years passed before this book could obtain the Pope's approbation. Clement X. refused it positively. Nay, several Roman Catholic Priests were rigorously treated and severely persecuted for preaching the doctrine contained in the Exposition of Bossuet, which was moreover formally condemned by the University of Louvain in the year 1685, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book." (Vol. v. p. 126.)

I am not presuming to draw an illustration from the history of Bossuet, except as regards his intention and its result. No one can accuse him of wantonness. What happened to him in spite of great abilities, may happen to others in defect of them.

Several obvious illustrations may be given from the controversies to which the Tracts for the Times have given rise. Much attention, for instance, has of late years been paid by learned men to the question of the origin of our public Services. The Tracts have made use of the results of their investigations with a view of exalting our ideas of the

sacredness of our Eucharistical Rite; but in proportion as they have discerned what may be truly called an awful light resting on its component parts, they have discovered also that those parts have experienced some change in their disposition and circumstances by the hand of time; and accordingly, the higher appreciation the Tracts tend to create of the substance of the Service in the minds of their readers, the greater regret do they incidentally infuse, were they ever so unwilling to do so, that any external causes should have interfered with the shape in which we at this day receive it. The effect then has been to raise our reverence towards the whole indefinitely, yet to fling around that reverence somewhat of a melancholy feeling. I am not defending either process or result, but shewing how good and evil have gone together.

Again, as regards the doctrine of Purgatory, that the present Roman doctrine was not Catholically received in the first ages, is as clear as any fact of history. But there is an argument which Roman controversialists use in its favour, founded on a fact of very early antiquity, the practice of praying for the faithful departed. To meet this objection, the Tracts gave a reprint of Archbishop Ussher's chapter on the subject in his Answer to a Jesuit, in which he shews that the objects of those prayers were very different from those which the Roman doctrine of Purgatory requires. Thus the argument in question is effectually overthrown, but at the expense of incidentally bringing to light a primitive practice confessedly uncongenial to our present views of reli-



gion. In other words, if the Churchman is by the result of the discussion confirmed against Romanism, he has been incidentally, and for the moment, (I cannot deny it,) unsettled in some of his existing opinions.

Or again, the charge brought against the defenders of Baptismal Regeneration has commonly been, that such a doctrine explained away regeneration, and made a mere name and a shadow of that gift of which Scripture speaks so awfully. We answer, "So far from it, every one is in a worse condition for being regenerate, if he is not in a better. If he resist the grace he has received, it is a burden to him, not a blessing. He cannot take it for granted, that all is right with his soul, and think no more about it; for the gift involves responsibilities as well as privileges." And thus, while engaged in maintaining the truth, that all Christians are in a state of grace, we incidently elicit the further truth, that sin after Baptism is a heavier matter than sin before it; or, in maintaining the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, we introduce the doctrine of repentance. We fortify our brethren in one direction; and may be charged with unsettling them in another.

Or again, in defending such doctrines and practices of the Church as Infant Baptism or the Episcopal Succession, the Tracts have argued that they rested on substantially the same basis as the Canon of Scripture, viz. the testimony of ancient Christendom. But to those who think this basis weak, the argument becomes a disparagement of the Canon, not a recommendation of the Creed.

My Lord, I have not said a word to imply that this disturbing and unsettling process is indissolubly connected with argumentative efforts in defence of our own system. I only say, that the good *naturally* runs into the evil; and so, without entering into the question whether or how they might have been kept apart in the Tracts, I am accounting for what looks like wantonness, yet I trust is not.

And perhaps I may be permitted to add, that our difficulties are much increased in a place like this, where there are a number of persons of practised intellects, who with or without unfriendly motives are ever drawing out the ultimate conclusions in which our principles result, and forcing us to affirm or deny what we would fain not consider or not pronounce upon. I am not complaining of this as unfair to us at all, but am shewing that we may have said extreme things, yet not from any wanton disregard of the feelings and opinions of others. The appeal is made to reason, and reason has its own laws, and does not depend on our will to take the more or less; and this is not less the case as regards the result, even though it be false reason which we follow, and our conclusions be wrong from our failing to detect the counteracting considerations which would avert the principles we hold from the direction in which we pursue them. And a conscientious feeling sometimes operates to keep men from concealing a conclusion which they think they see involved in their principles, and which others see not; and moreover a dread of appearing disingenuous

to others, who are directing their minds to the same subjects.

An instance has occurred in point quite lately as regards a subject introduced into Tract 90, which I am very glad to have an opportunity of mentioning to your Lordship. I have said in the Postscript of a Letter which I have lately addressed to Dr. Jelf, that the "vagueness and deficiency" of some parts of the Tract, in the conclusions drawn from the premises stated, arose in great measure from the author's being "more bent on laying down his principle than defining its results." In truth I was very unwilling to commit the view of the Articles which I was taking, to any precise statement of the ultimate approaches towards the Roman system allowed by our own. To say *how far* a person may go, is almost to tempt him to go up to the boundary line. I am far from denying that an evil arose from the vagueness which ensued, but it arose mainly from this feeling. Accordingly I left, for instance, the portion which treated of the Invocation of Saints without any definite conclusion at all, after bringing together various passages in illustration. However, friends and opponents discovered that my premises required, what I was very unwilling to state categorically, for various reasons, that the *ora pro nobis* was not on my shewing necessarily included in the invocation of Saints which the Article condemns. And in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, I have been obliged to declare this, under a representation that to pass it over would be considered disingenuous. I avail myself, however, of



the opportunity which this Letter to your Lordship affords me, without any suggestion as your Lordship knows, from yourself, or from any one else, to state as plainly as I can, lest my brethren should mistake me, my great apprehension concerning the use even of such modified invocations. Every feeling which interferes with God's sovereignty in our hearts, is of an idolatrous nature; and, as men are tempted to idolize their rank and substance, or their talent, or their children, or themselves, so may they easily be led to substitute the thought of Saints and Angels for the one supreme idea of their Creator and Redeemer, which should fill them. It is nothing to the purpose to urge the example of such men as St. Bernard in defence of such invocations. The holier the man, the less likely are they to be injurious to him; but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same. There is much less of awe and severity in the devotion which rests upon created excellence as its object, and worldly minds will gladly have recourse to it, to be saved the necessity of lifting up their eyes to their Sanctifier and Judge. And the multitude of men are incapable of many ideas; one is enough for them, and if the image of a Saint is admitted into their heart, he occupies it, and there is no room for Almighty God. And moreover there is the additional danger of *presumptuousness* in addressing Saints and Angels; by which I mean cases when men do so from a sort of curiosity, as the heathen might feel towards strange and exciting rites of worship, not with a clear conscience and spontane-

ously, but rather with certain doubts and misgivings about its propriety, and a secret feeling that it does not become them, and a certain forcing of themselves in consequence.

4. Unless your Lordship had ordered me to speak my mind on these subjects, I should feel that in these reflections I was adopting a tone very unlike that which becomes a private Clergyman addressing his Diocesan; but, encouraged by the notion that I am obeying your wishes, I will proceed in what I feel it very strange to allow myself in, though I do so. And, since I have been naturally led into the subject of Romanism, I will continue it, and explain the misapprehension which has been entertained of my views concerning it.

I do not wonder that persons who happen to fall upon certain writings of mine, and are unacquainted with others, and, as is natural, do not understand the sense in which I use certain words and phrases, should think that I explain away the differences between the Roman system and our own, which I hope I do not. They find in what I have written, no abuse, at least I trust not, of the individual Roman Catholic, nor of the Church of Rome, viewed abstractedly as a Church. I cannot speak against the Church of Rome, viewed in her formal character, as a true Church, since she is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone." Nor can I speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God's people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession. But what

I have spoken, and do strongly speak against is, that energetic system and engrossing influence in the Church *by which* it acts towards us, and meets our eyes, like a cloud filling it, to the eclipse of all that is holy, whether in its ordinances or its members. This system I have called in what I have written, Romanism or Popery, and by Romanists or Papists I mean all its members, so far as they are under the power of these principles; and while, and so far as this system exists, and it does exist now as fully as heretofore, I say that we can have no peace with that Church, however we may secretly love its particular members. I cannot speak against its private members; I should be doing violence to every feeling of my nature if I did, and your Lordship would not require it of me. I wish from my heart we and they were one; but we cannot, without a sin, sacrifice truth to peace; and, in the words of Archbishop Laud, "till Rome be other than it is" we must be estranged from her.

This view which, not inconsistently, I hope, with our chief divines, I would maintain against the Roman errors, seems to me to allow at once of zeal for the truth, and charity towards individuals and towards the Church of Rome herself. It presents her under a twofold aspect, and while recognizing her as an appointment of God on the one hand, it leads us practically to shun her, as beset with heinous and dangerous influences on the other. It is drawn out in the following extracts, under which I have thought it best to set it before your Lordship, rather than in statements made for the occasion, for the



reason I have given above. I think they will serve to shew, consistently with those which I made in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, both the real and practical stand I would make against Romanism, yet the natural opening there is for an unfounded suspicion that I feel more favourably towards it than I do.

“Our controversy with Romanists,” I say, “turns more upon facts than upon first principles; with Protestant sectaries it is more about principles than about facts. This general contrast between the two religions, which I would not seem to extend beyond what the sober truth warrants, for the sake of an antithesis, is paralleled in the common remark of our most learned controversialists, that Romanism *holds the foundation, or is the truth overlaid with corruptions*. This is saying the same thing in other words. They discern in it the great outlines of primitive Christianity, but they find them touched, if nothing worse, touched and tainted by error, and so made dangerous to the multitude,—dangerous except to men of spiritual minds, who can undo the evil, arresting the tendencies of the system by their own purity, and restoring it to the sweetness and freshness of its original state. The very force of the word *corruption*, implies that this is the peculiarity of Romanism. All error indeed of whatever kind, may be called a corruption of truth; still we properly apply the term to such kinds of error as are not denials but perversions, distortions, or excesses of it. Such is the relation of Romanism towards true Catholicity. . . .

“The same view of Romanism is implied, when we call our ecclesiastical changes in the sixteenth century a Reformation. A building has not been reformed or repaired, when it has been pulled down and built up again; but the word is used when it has been left substantially what it was before, only amended or restored in detail. In like manner we Anglo-Catholics do not profess a different religion from

the Romanists, we profess their Faith *all but* their corruptions.

“Again, this same character of Romanism as a perversion, not a contradiction of Christian Truth, is confessed as often as members of our Church in controversy with it contend, as they may rightly do, that it must be judged, not by the formal decrees of the Council of Trent, as its advocates are fond of doing, but by its practical working and its existing state in the countries which profess it. Romanists would fain confine us in controversy to the consideration of the bare and acknowledged principles of their Church; we consider this to be an unfair restriction; why? because we conceive that Romanism is far more faulty in its details than in its formal principles, and that Councils, to which its adherents would send us, have more to do with its abstract system than with its practical working; that the abstract system contains, for the most part, *tendencies* to evil, which the actual working brings out, thus supplying illustrations of that evil which is really though latently contained in principles capable in themselves of an honest interpretation. Thus for instance, the decree concerning Purgatory might be charitably made almost to conform to the doctrine of St. Austin, or St. Chrysostom, were it not for the comment on it afforded by the popular belief as existing in those countries which hold it, and by the opinions of the Roman schools.” *On Romanism*, p. 50—54.

Again,

“I have been speaking of Romanism, not as an existing political sect among us, but considered in itself, in its abstract system, and in a state of quiescence. Viewed indeed in action, and as realized in its present partisans, it is but one out of the many denominations which are the disgrace of our age and country. In temper and conduct it does but resemble that unruly Protestantism which lies on our other side, and it submits without reluctance to be

allied and to act with it towards the overthrow of a purer religion . . . . The reproach of the present Romanists, is that they are inconsistent ; and it is a reproach which is popularly felt to be just. They are confessedly unlike the loyal men who rallied round the throne of our first Charles, or who fought, however ill-advisedly, for his exiled descendants . . . . I have here considered Romanism in its abstract professions for two reasons. First, I would willingly believe, that in spite of the violence and rancour of its public supporters, there are many individuals in its communion of gentle, affectionate, and deeply religious minds ; and such a belief is justified when we find that the *necessary* difference between us and them is not one of essential principle, that it is the difference of superstition, and not of unbelief, from religion. Next, I have insisted upon it, by way of shewing what must be the nature of their Reformation, if in God's merciful counsels a Reformation awaits them. It will be far more a reform of their popular usages and opinions, and Ecclesiastical policy, or a destruction of what is commonly called Popery, than of their abstract principles and maxims." *On Romanism*, p. 56, 57.

And again,

"They profess to appeal to primitive Christianity; we honestly take their ground, as holding it ourselves ; but when the controversy grows animated, and descends into details, they suddenly leave it, and desire to finish the dispute on some other field. In like manner in their teaching and acting, they begin as if in the name of all the Fathers at once, but will be found in the sequel to prove, instruct, and enjoin, simply in their own name. Our differences from them, considered not in theory but in fact, are in no sense matters of detail and questions of degree. In truth, there is a tenet in their theology which assumes quite a new position in relation to the rest, when we pass from the abstract and quiescent theory to the practical workings of the



system. The infallibility of the existing Church is then found to be its first principle, whereas, before, it was a necessary, but a secondary doctrine. Whatever principles they profess in theory, resembling or coincident with our own, yet when they come to particulars, when they have to prove this or that article of their creed, they supersede the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity by the pretence of the infallibility of the Church, thus solving the whole question, by a summary and final interpretation both of Antiquity and of Scripture." *On Romanism*, p. 59, 60.

In the following passage the Anglican and Roman systems are contrasted with each other.

"Both we and Romanists hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of Faith, or saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic. They maintain that faith depends on the Church, we that the Church is built on the faith. By Church Catholic, we mean the Church Universal, as descended from the Apostles; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. They consider the see of St. Peter, to have a promise of permanence; we the Church Catholic and Apostolic. Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we what it has actually so declared from the beginning. We hold that the Church Catholic will never depart from those outlines of doctrine, which the Apostles formally published; they that she will never depart in any of her acts from that entire system, written and oral, public and private, explicit and implicit, which they received and taught; we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of discrimination.

"Again, both they and we anathematize those who deny the Faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic Creed. The creed of Romanism is ever subject to

increase; ours is fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the Athanasian Creed; Romanists extend it to Pope Pius's. They cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch, not even from themselves. We are at peace with Rome as regards the essentials of faith; but she tolerates us as little as any sect or heresy. We admit her Baptism and her Orders; her custom is" [conditionally] "to re-baptize and re-ordain our members who chance to join her." *On Romanism*, p. 259, 260.

And I shew, in one of the Tracts, the unfairness of detaching the Canons of Trent from the actual conduct of the Roman Church for any practical purposes, while things are as they are, as follows:—

"An equally important question remains to be discussed; viz. What the *sources* are, whence we are to gather our opinions of Popery. Here the Romanists complain of their opponents, that, instead of referring to the authoritative documents of their Church, Protestants avail themselves of any errors or excesses of individuals in it, as if the Church were responsible for acts and opinions which it does not enjoin. Thus the legends of relics, superstitions about images, the cruelty of particular Prelates or Kings, or the accidental fury of a populace, are unfairly imputed to the Church itself.... Accordingly they claim to be judged by their formal documents, especially by the decrees of the Council of Trent.

"Now here we shall find the truth to lie between the two contending parties. Candour will oblige us to grant that the mere acts of individuals should not be imputed to the body;...yet not so much as they themselves desire. For though the acts of individuals are not the acts of the Church, yet they may be the results, and therefore illustrations, of its principles. We cannot consent then to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine

decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their Doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. The case stands as follows. A certain system of teaching and practice has existed in the Churches of the Roman Communion for many centuries; this system was discriminated and fixed in all its outlines at the Council of Trent. It is therefore not unnatural, or rather it is the procedure we adopt in any historical research, to take the general opinions and conduct of the Church in elucidation of their Synodal decrees; just as we take the tradition of the Church Catholic and Apostolic as the legitimate interpreter of Scripture, or of the Apostles' Creed. On the other hand, it is as natural that these decrees, being necessarily concise and guarded, should be much less objectionable than the actual system they represent. It is not wonderful then, yet it is unreasonable, that Romanists should protest against our going beyond these decrees in adducing evidence of their Church's doctrine, on the ground that nothing more than an assent to them is requisite for communion with her: *e. g.* the Creed of Pope Pius, which is framed upon the Tridentine decrees, and is the Roman Creed of Communion, only says, 'I firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that souls therein detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful,' nothing being said of its being a place of punishment, nothing, or all but nothing, which does not admit of being explained of merely an intermediate state.

"Now supposing we found ourselves in the Roman Communion, of course it would be a great relief to find that we were not bound to believe more than this vague statement, nor should we (I conceive) on account of the received interpretation about Purgatory superadded to it, be obliged to leave our Church. But it is another matter entirely, whether we who are external to that Church, are not bound to consider it as one whole system, written and unwritten,



defined indeed and adjusted by general statements, but not limited to them or coincident with them.

"The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism, affords us a parallel case and a direction in this question. The Arian Creeds were often quite unexceptionable, differing from the orthodox only in this, that they omitted the celebrated word *Homoïusion*, and in consequence did not obviate the possibility of that perverse explanation of them, which in fact their framers adopted. Why then did the Catholics refuse to subscribe them? Why did they rather submit to banishment from one end of the Roman world to the other? Why did they become Confessors and Martyrs? The answer is ready. They interpreted the language of the creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice. On the other hand, when at Ariminum they were seduced into a subscription of one of these creeds, though unobjectionable in its wording, their opponents instantly triumphed, and circulated the news that the Catholic world had come over to their opinion. It may be added that, in consequence, ever since that era, phrases have been banished from the language of theology which heretofore had been innocently used by orthodox teachers.

"Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely, and only absent where external checks are present, sanctioned moreover by its celebrated teachers and expositors, and advocated by its controversialists with the tacit consent of the whole body, under such circumstances

surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics during the ascendancy of Arianism. Surely it is not unfair in such a case to interpret the formal document of belief by the realized form of it in the Church, and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot, as the Fathers at Ariminum, to the corruptions of those who profess it.

“To take the instances of the Adoration of Images and the Invocation of Saints. The Tridentine Decree declares that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the Saints, and that the Images of Christ, and the Blessed Virgin, and the other Saints should ‘receive due honour and veneration;’ words, which themselves go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious Christian, though possibly admitting of a honest interpretation. Now we know in matter of fact that in various parts of the Roman Church, a worship approaching to idolatrous is actually paid to Saints and Images, in countries very different from each other, as for instance, Italy and the Netherlands, and has been countenanced by eminent men and doctors, and that without any serious or successful protest from any quarter: further that, though there may be countries where no scandal of the kind exists, yet these are such as have, in their neighbourhood to Protestantism, a practical restraint upon the natural tendency of their system.

“Moreover, the silence which has been observed, age after age, by the Roman Church, as regards these excesses, is a point deserving of serious attention;—for two reasons: first, because of the very solemn warnings pronounced by our Lord and His Apostle, against those who introduce scandals into the Church, warnings which seem almost prophetic of such as exist in the Latin branches of it. Next it must be considered that the Roman Church has had the power to denounce and extirpate them. Not to mention its use of its Apostolical powers in other matters, it has had the civil



power at its command, as it has shewn in the case of errors which less called for its interference; all of which shews it has not felt sensitively on the subject of this particular evil.”  
 —*Tracts for the Times*, No. 71. p. 14—18.

And in the following passage, written in the course of last year, the contrariety between the Primitive and Roman systems is pointed out.

“Allowing the Church Catholic ever so much power over the faith, allowing that it may add what it will, so that it does not contradict what has been determined in former times, yet let us come to the plain question, Does the Church, according to Romanists, know more now than the Apostles knew? Their theory seems to be that the whole faith was present in the minds of the Apostles, nay, of all Saints at all times, but in great measure as a matter of mere temper, feeling, and unconscious opinion, or implicitly, not in the way of exact statements and in an intellectual form. All men certainly hold a number of truths and act on them, without knowing it; when a question is asked about them, then they are obliged to reflect what their opinion has ever been, and they bring before themselves and assent to doctrines which before were but latent within them. We have all heard of men changing to so-called Unitarianism, and confessing on a review of themselves that they had been Unitarians all along without knowing it, till some accident tore the bandage off their eyes. In like manner the Roman Catholics, we suppose, would maintain that the Apostles were implicit Tridentines; that the Church held in the first age what she holds now; only that heresy, by raising questions, has led to her throwing her faith into dogmatic shape, and has served to precipitate truths which before were held in solution. Now this is all very well in the abstract, but let us return to the point, as to what the Apostles held and did, and what they did not. Does the Romanist mean, for instance, to tell us that St. Paul the



Apostle, when he was in perils of robbers or perils by the sea, offered up his addresses to St. Mary, and vowed some memorial to her, if she would be pleased ‘deprecari pro illo Filium Dei?’ Does he mean to say that the same Apostle, during that period of his life when as yet he was not ‘perfect’ or had ‘attained,’ was accustomed to pray that the merits of St. John the Baptist should be imputed to him? Did he or did he not hold that St. Peter could give indulgences to shorten the prospective sufferings of the Corinthians in purgatory? We do not deny that St. Paul certainly does bring out his thoughts only in answer to express questions asked, and according to the occasion; that St. John has written a Gospel, as later, so also more dogmatic, than his fellow-Evangelists, in consequence of the rise of heresy. We do not at all mean to affirm, that the sacred writers said out at one time all they had to say. There are many things we can *imagine* them doing and holding, which yet, in matter of fact, we believe they did not do, or did not hold. We can *imagine* them administering extreme unction or wearing copes. Again, there are many things which they *could* neither hold nor do, merely from the circumstances of the times or the moment. They could not determine whether general councils might or might not be held without the consent of Princes, or determine the authority of the Vulgate before it was written, or enjoin infant baptism before Christians had children, or decide upon the value of heretical baptism before there were heretics, and before those heretics were baptized. But still there are limits to these concessions; we cannot imagine an Apostle saying and doing what Romanists say and do: can they imagine it themselves? Do they themselves, for instance, think that St. Paul was in the habit of saying what Bellarmine and others say,—*Laus Deo Virginiq̃ Matri*? Would they not pronounce a professed epistle of St. Paul’s which contained these words spurious on this one ground?”

It is commonly urged by Romanists, that the Notes of their Church are sufficiently clear to enable the private Christian to dispense with argument in joining their Communion in preference to any other. Now in the following passage it is observed, that that Communion has Notes of error upon it, serving in practice quite as truly as a guide from it, as the Notes which it brings forward can be made to tell in its favour.

“Our Lord said of false prophets, ‘By their fruits shall ye know them;’ and, however the mind may be entangled theoretically, yet surely it will fall upon certain marks in Rome which seem intended to convey to the simple and honest enquirer a solemn warning to keep clear of her, while she carries them about her. Such are her denying the Cup to the laity, her idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin, her Image-worship, her recklessness in anathematizing, and her schismatical and overbearing spirit. Surely we have more reason for thinking that her doctrines concerning Images and the Saints are false, than that her saying they are Apostolical is true. I conceive, then, on the whole, that while Rome confirms by her accordant witness our own teaching in all greater things, she does not tend by her novelties, and violence, and threats, to disturb the practical certainty of Catholic doctrine, or to seduce from us any sober and conscientious enquirer.” *On Romanism*, p. 324, 325.

And in one of the Tracts for the Times, speaking of certain Invocations in the Breviary, I say,

“These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them; and it has been the strong feeling

that this is really the case, that has led the writer of these pages fearlessly and securely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell upon the antiquity of the Roman Ritual. He has felt that, since the Romanists required an unqualified assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that there were passages which no Anglican ever could admit, praise the true Catholic portion of it as much as he might, he did not in the slightest degree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism." *Tract 75. p. 9, 10.*

"They" [the Antiphons to the blessed Virgin] "shall be here given in order to shew clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views." *Tract 75. p. 23.*

In the foregoing passages, protests will be found against the Roman worship of St. Mary, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Purgatory, Denial of the Cup, Indulgences; and Infallibility; besides those which are entered against the fundamental theory out of which these errors arise.

5. And now having said, I trust, as much as your Lordship requires on the subject of Romanism, I will add a few words, to complete my explanation, in acknowledgment of the inestimable privilege I feel in being a member of that Church over which your Lordship, with others, presides. Indeed, did I not feel it to be a privilege which I am able to seek no



where else on earth, why should I be at this moment writing to your Lordship? What motive have I for an unreserved and joyful submission to your authority, but the feeling that the Church in which your Lordship rules is a divinely-ordained channel of supernatural grace to the souls of her members? Why should I not prefer my own opinion, and my own way of acting, to that of the Bishop's, except that I know full well that in matters indifferent I should be acting lightly towards the Spouse of Christ and the Awful Presence which dwells in her, if I hesitated a moment to put your Lordship's will before my own? I know full well that your Lordship's kindness to me personally, would be in itself quite enough to win any but the most insensible heart, and, did a clear matter of conscience occur in which I felt bound to act for myself, my feelings towards your Lordship would be a most severe trial to me, independently of the higher considerations to which I have alluded; but I trust I have shewn my dutifulness to you prior to the influence of personal motives; and this I have done because I think that to belong to the Catholic Church is the first of all privileges here below, as involving in it heavenly privileges, and because I consider the Church over which your Lordship presides to be the Catholic Church in this country. Surely then I have no need to profess in words, I will not say my attachment, but my deep reverence towards the Mother of Saints, when I am shewing it in action; yet that words may not be altogether wanting, I beg to lay before your Lordship the following extract from a

defence of the English Church, which I wrote against a Roman controversialist in the course of the last year.

“The Church is emphatically a living body, and there can be no greater proof of a particular communion being part of the Church, than the appearance in it of a continued and abiding energy, nor a more melancholy proof of its being a corpse than torpidity. We say an energy continued and abiding, for accident will cause the activity of a moment, and an external principle give the semblance of self-motion. On the other hand, even a living body may for a while be asleep. And here we have an illustration of what we just now urged about the varying cogency of the Notes of the Church according to times and circumstances. No one can deny that at times the Roman Church itself, restless as it is at most times, has been in a state of sleep or disease, so great as to resemble death; the words of Baronius, speaking of the tenth century, are well known: “*Dormiebat tunc plane alto, ut apparet, sopore Christus in navi, cum hisce flantibus validis ventis, navis ipsa fluctibus operiretur. Una illa reliqua consolatio piis, quia etsi Dominus dormivit, in eadem tamen navi dormivit.*” It concerns then those who deny that we are the true Church, because we have not at present this special Note, intercommunion with other Christians, to shew cause why the Roman Church in the tenth century should be so accounted, with profligates, or rather the profligate mothers of profligate sons, for her supreme rulers. And still notwithstanding life is a note of the Church; she alone revives, even if she declines; heretical and schismatical bodies cannot keep life; they gradually become cold, stiff, and insensible. They may do some energetic work at first from excitement or remaining warmth, as the Arians converted the Goths, though even this seems, as the history shews us, to have been an accident, for which they can claim

no praise ; or as the Nestorians spread in the East, from circumstances which need not here be noticed. But wait awhile, and ‘see the end of these men.’ ‘I myself,’ says the Psalmist, ‘have seen the ungodly in great power, and flourishing like a green bay-tree. I went by, and lo, he was gone ; I sought him, but his place could no where be found.’ Heresies and schisms, whatever be their promise at first, and whatever be their struggles, yet gradually and surely tend not to be. Utter dissolution is the scope to which their principles are directed from the first, and towards which for the most part they steadily and continually move. Or, if the principle of destruction in them, be not so living as to hurry them forward in their career, then they remain inert and motionless, where they first are found, kept together in one by external circumstances, and going to pieces as soon as air is let in upon them. Now if there ever were a Church on whom the experiment has been tried, whether it had life in it or not, the English is that one. For three centuries it has endured all vicissitudes of fortune. It has endured in trouble and prosperity, under seduction and under oppression. It has been practised upon by theorists, browbeaten by sophists, intimidated by princes, betrayed by false sons, laid waste by tyranny, corrupted by wealth, torn by schism, and persecuted by fanaticism. Revolutions have come upon it sharply and suddenly, to and fro, hot and cold, as if to try what it was made of. It has been a sort of battle-field on which opposite principles have been tried. No opinion, however extreme any way, but may be found, as the Romanists are not slow to reproach us, among its Bishops and Divines. Yet what has been its career upon the whole ? Which way has it been moving through three hundred years ? Where does it find itself at the end ? Lutherans have tended to Rationalism ; Calvinists have become Socinians ; but what has it become ? As far as its Formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have



grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement; every act, every crisis, which marks its course, has been upward. It never was in so miserable case as in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. At the end of Elizabeth's there was a conspicuous revival of the true doctrine. Advancements were made in the Canons of 1603. How much was done under Charles the First, need not be said; and done permanently, so as to remain to this day in spite of the storm which immediately arose, sweeping off the chief agents in the work, and for a time levelling the Church to the ground. More was done than even yet appears, as a philosophical writer has lately remarked, in the Convocation of 1661. One juncture there was of a later date (1688) which seemed to threaten a relapse; yet it was the only crisis in which no Ecclesiastical act took place. The temper, however, of the Church, certainly did go back; a secular and semi-sceptical spirit came in. Now then was the time when the Church lay open to injury; yet, by a wonderful providence, the Convocation being, during this period, suspended, there was no means of making permanent impressions on its character; and thus civil tyranny was its protection against itself. That very Convocation too expired in an act of zeal and faith. In our own times, temporal defences have been removed which the most strenuous political partisans of the Church considered essential to its well-being, and the loss of which they deplored as the first steps towards its ruin. To their surprise these well-intentioned men have beheld what they thought a mere establishment, dependent on man to create and destroy, rise up and walk with a life of its own, such as it had before they and their constitution came into being. How many learned Divines have we had, even our enemies being judges! and in proportion as they were learned, so on the whole have they approximated towards the full ancient truth. Or take again those whom by a natural instinct 'all the people count as Prophets,' and will

it not be found that either altogether or in those works which are most popular, those writers are ruled by primitive and Catholic principles? No man, for instance, was an abler writer in the last century than Warburton, or more famous in his day; yet the glare is over, and now Bishops Wilson and Horne, men of far inferior powers, but of Catholic temper and principles, fill the doctor's Chair in the eyes of the many. What a note of the Church is the mere production of a man like Butler, a pregnant fact much to be meditated on! and how strange it is, if it be as it seems to be, that the real influence of his work is only just now beginning! and who can prophecy in what it will end? Thus our Divines grow with centuries, expanding after their death in the minds of their readers into more and more exact Catholicism as years roll on. Nay even our errors and heterodoxies turn to good. Wesleyanism in itself tends to heresy, if it was not heretical in the outset; but so far as it has been in the Church, it has been overruled to rouse and stimulate us, when we were asleep. Moreover look at the internal state of the Church at this moment; much that is melancholy is there, strife, division, error. But still on the whole, enlarge on the evils as you will, there is *life* there, perceptible, visible life; rude indeed, undisciplined, perhaps self-willed, but life; and not the life of death, not that heretical restlessness, which, as we have observed, only runs out the quicker for its activity, and hastens to be no more, but, we may humbly trust, a heavenly principle after all, which is struggling towards development, and gives presage of truth and holiness to come. Look across the Atlantic to the daughter Churches of England in the States; shall one that is barren bear a child in her old age? yet 'the barren hath borne seven.' Schismatic branches put out their leaves at once in an expiring effort; our Church has waited three centuries, and then blossoms, like Aaron's rod, budding and blooming and yielding fruit, while the rest are dry. And

lastly look at the present position of the Church at home; there too we shall find a Note of the true city of God, the Holy Jerusalem. She is in warfare with the world as the Church Militant should be; she is rebuking the world, she is hated, she is pillaged by the world. And as if it were providentially intended to shew this resemblance between her and the sister branches, what place she has here, that they have there; the same enemies encompassing both them and her, and the same trials and exploits lying in prospect. She has a common cause with them, as far as they are faithful, if not a common speech and language; and is together with them in warfare, if not in peace.

“Much might be said on this subject. At all times, since Christianity came into the world, an open contest has been going on between religion and irreligion; and the true Church, of course, has ever been on the religious side. This then is a sure test in every age, *where* the Christian should stand. . . . Now applying this simple criterion to the public parties of this day, it is very plain that the English Church is at present on God’s side, and therefore so far God’s Church;—we are sorry to be obliged to add that there is as little doubt on which side English Romanism is. It must be a very galling thought to serious minds who profess it, to feel that they are standing with the enemies of God, cooperating with the haters of truth and haters of the light, and thereby prejudicing religious minds even against those verities which Rome continues to hold.

“As for the English Church, surely she has Notes enough, ‘the signs of an Apostle in all patience, and signs and wonders and mighty deeds.’ She has the Note of possession, the Note of freedom from party-titles; the Note of life, a tough life and a vigorous; she has ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church. Those of Bellarmine’s Notes, which she certainly has not, are intercommunion with Christendom, the glory of miracles, and the prophetic



light, but the question is, whether she has not enough of divinity about her to satisfy her sister Churches on their own principles, that she is one body with them."

6. This may be sufficient to shew my feelings towards my Church, as far as statements on paper can shew them. I have already, however, referred to what is much more conclusive, a practical evidence of them; and I think I can shew your Lordship besides without difficulty that my present conduct is no solitary instance of such obedience, but that I have observed an habitual submission to things as they are, and have avoided in practice, as far as might be, any indulgence of private tastes and opinions, which left to myself perhaps I should have pursued.

And first, as regards my public teaching; though every one has his peculiarities, and I of course in the number, yet I do hope that it has not on the whole transgressed that liberty of opinion which is allowed on all hands to the Anglican Clergyman. Nay I might perhaps insist upon it, that in the general run of my Sermons, fainter and fewer traces will be found than might have been expected of those characteristics of doctrine, with which my name is commonly associated. I might without offence have introduced what is technically called High-Church doctrine in much greater fulness; since there are many who do not hold it to my own extent, or with my own eagerness, whose teaching is more prominently coloured by it. My Sermons have been far more practical than doctrinal; and this, from a dislike of introducing a character and tone of preaching very different from that which is

generally to be found. And I hope this circumstance may serve as my reply to an apprehension which has been felt, as if what I say in Tract 90 concerning a cast of opinions which is not irreconcilable with our Articles, involves an introduction of those opinions into the pulpit. Yet who will maintain, that what merely happens not to be forbidden or denied in the Articles, may at once be made the subject of teaching or observance? There is nothing concerning the Inspiration of Scripture in the Articles; yet would a Bishop allow a Clergyman openly to deny it in the pulpit? May the Scripture Miracles be explained away, because the Articles say nothing about them? Would your Lordship allow me to preach in favour of duelling, gaming, or simony? or to revile persons by name from the pulpit? or be grossly and violently political? Every one will surely appreciate the importance and sacredness of Pulpit instruction; and will allow, that though the holding certain opinions may be compatible with subscription to the Articles, the publishing and teaching them may be inconsistent with ecclesiastical station.

Those who frequent St. Mary's, know that the case is the same as regards the mode in which worship is conducted there. I have altered nothing I found established; when I have increased the number of the Services, and had to determine points connected with the manner of performing them for myself, if there was no danger of offending others, I have followed my own judgment, but not otherwise. I have left many things, which I

did not like, and which most other persons would have altered. And here, with your Lordship's leave, I will make allusion to one mistake concerning me which I believe has reached your Lordship's ears, and which I only care to explain to my Bishop. The explanation, I trust, will be an additional proof of my adherence to the principle of acquiescing in the state of things in which I find myself. It has been said, I believe, that in the Communion Service I am in the practice of mixing water with the wine, and that of course on a religious or ecclesiastical ground. This is not the case. We are in the custom at St. Mary's of celebrating the Holy Communion every Sunday, and most weeks early in the morning. When I began the early celebration, communicants represented to me that the wine was so strong as to distress them at that early hour. Accordingly I mixed it with water in the bottle. However, it became corrupt. On this I mixed it at the time. I speak honestly when I say that this has been my only motive. I have not mixed it when the Service has been in the middle of the day.

If I were not writing to my Bishop, I should feel much shame at writing so much about myself; but confession cannot be called egotism. Friend and stranger have from time to time asked for my cooperation in the attempt to gain additional power for the Church. I have been accustomed to answer that it was my duty to acquiesce in the state of things under which I found myself, and to serve God, if so be, in it. New precedents indeed, con-



firming or aggravating our present Ecclesiastical defects, I have ever desired to oppose; but as regards changes, persons to whom I defer very much, know that, rightly or wrongly, I have discountenanced, for instance, any movement tending to the repeal even of the Statutes of *Præmunire*, which has been frequently agitated, under the notion that such matters were not our business, and that we had better “remain in the calling wherein we were called.” Of course I cannot be blind to the fact that “time is the great innovator;” and that the course of events may of itself put the Church in possession of greater liberty of action, as in time past it has abridged it. This would be the act of a higher power; and then I should think it a duty to act according to that new state in which the Church found itself. Knowledge and virtue certainly are power. When the Church’s gifts were doubled, its influence would be multiplied a hundred fold; and influence tends to become constituted authority. This is the nature of things, which I do not attempt to oppose; but I have no wish at all to take part in any measures which aim at changes.

And in like manner I have set my face altogether against suggestions which zealous and warm-hearted persons sometimes have made of reviving the project of Archbishop Wake, for considering the differences between ourselves and the foreign Churches with a view to their adjustment. Our business is with ourselves—to make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy our high calling. Let the Church of Rome

do the same, and it will come nearer to us, and will cease to be what we one and all mean, when we speak of Rome. To be anxious for a composition of differences, is to begin at the end. Did God visit us with large measures of His grace, and the Roman Catholics also, they would be drawn to us, and would acknowledge our Church as the Catholic Church in this country, and would give up whatever offended and grieved us in their doctrine and worship, and would unite themselves to us. This would be a true union; but political reconciliations are but outward and hollow, and fallacious. And till they renounce political efforts, and manifest in their public measures the light of holiness and truth, perpetual warfare is our only prospect. It was the prophetic announcement concerning the Elijah of the first Advent, that he should "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." This is the only change which promises good and is worth an effort.

What I have been saying as regards Roman Catholics, I trust I have kept steadily before me in ecclesiastical matters generally. While I have considered that we ought to be content with the outward circumstances in which Providence has placed us, I have tried to feel that the great business of one and all of us is, to endeavour to raise the moral tone of the Church. It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing; whatever be a

religious body's relations to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting. I desire to look at this first, in all persons and all communities. Where Almighty God stirs the heart, there His other gifts follow in time; sanctity is the great Note of the Church. If the Established Church of Scotland has this Note, I will hope all good things of it; if the Roman Church in Ireland has it not, I can hope no good of it. And in like manner, in our own Church, I will unite with all persons as brethren, who have this Note, without any distinction of party. Persons who know me can testify that I have endeavoured to cooperate with those who did not agree with me, and that again and again I have been put aside by them, not put them aside. I have never concealed my own opinions, nor wished them to conceal theirs; but have found that I could bear them better than they me. And I have long insisted upon it, that the only way in which the members of our Church, so widely differing in opinion at this time, can be brought together in one, is by a “turning of heart” to one another. Argumentative efforts are most useful for this end under this sacred feeling; but till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we



are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.

7. Before concluding, there is one more subject on which I wish briefly to address your Lordship, though it is one which I have neither direct claim nor encouragement to introduce to your Lordship's notice. Yet our Colleges here being situated in your Lordship's diocese, it is natural for me to allude to the lately expressed opinion of the Heads of Houses upon the Tract which has given rise to this Letter. I shall only do so, however, for the purpose of assuring your Lordship of the great sorrow it gives me to have incurred their disapprobation, and of the anxiety I have felt for some time past from the apprehension that I was incurring it. I reverence their position in the country too highly to be indifferent to their good opinion. I never can be indifferent to the opinion of those who hold in their hands the education of the classes on which our national well-being, spiritual and temporal, depends ; who preside over the foundations of "famous men" of old, whose "name liveth for evermore;" and from whom are from time to time selected the members of the sacred order to which your Lordship belongs. Considering my own peculiar position in the University, so much have these considerations pressed upon me for a long while, that, as various persons know, I seriously contemplated, some time since, the resignation of my Living, and was only kept from it by the advice of a friend to whom I felt I ought to submit myself. I say this, moreover, in explanation

of a Letter I lately addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, lest it should seem dictated either by a mere perception of what was becoming in my situation, or from some sudden softening of feeling under an unexpected event. It expressed my habitual deference to persons in station.

And now, my Lord, suffer me to thank your Lordship for your most abundant and extraordinary kindness towards me, in the midst of the exercise of your authority. I have nothing to be sorry for, except having made your Lordship anxious, and others whom I am bound to revere. I have nothing to be sorry for, but every thing to rejoice in and be thankful for. I have never taken pleasure in seeming to be able to move a party, and whatever influence I have had has been found not sought after. I have acted because others did not act, and have sacrificed a quiet which I prized. May God be with me in time to come, as He has been hitherto ! and He will be, if I can but keep my hand clean and my heart pure. I think I can bear, or at least will try to bear, any personal humiliation, so that I am preserved from betraying sacred interests, which the Lord of grace and power has given into my charge.

I am, My dear Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful and affectionate Servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

*Oriel College,*

*March 29th, 1841.*



